1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOVON SMITH,	No. 2:20-cv-00584 GGH P
12	Petitioner,	
13	V.	ORDER AND FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	RALPH DIAZ,	RECOMMENDATIONS
15	Respondent.	
16		I
<ul><li>16</li><li>17</li></ul>	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding	pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas
		pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis
17	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petition	
17 18	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petition affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00)	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis
17 18 19	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petition affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00)	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  1. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,
17 18 19 20	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitional affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00 the undersigned will recommend this action be application.	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  1. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,
17 18 19 20 21	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitional affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00) the undersigned will recommend this action be application.  Petitioner challenges his 2009 convictions.	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  1. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,  2. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus
17 18 19 20 21 22	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitional affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00) the undersigned will recommend this action be application.  Petitioner challenges his 2009 conviction a child causing death. ECF No. 1. The countries of the contribution of the contributio	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  ). See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,  e dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  ion in the Solano County Superior Court for assault
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitione affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00 the undersigned will recommend this action b application.  Petitioner challenges his 2009 convict on a child causing death. ECF No. 1. The coufiled an application for a writ of habeas corpu	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  1. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,  1. de dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  1. don in the Solano County Superior Court for assault  1. drt's records reveal that petitioner has previously
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitione affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00 the undersigned will recommend this action b application.  Petitioner challenges his 2009 convict on a child causing death. ECF No. 1. The coufiled an application for a writ of habeas corpu	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  2. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,  3. de dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  4. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  4. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  5. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  6. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  7. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpu
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitional affidavit or paid the required filing fee (\$5.00) the undersigned will recommend this action be application.  Petitioner challenges his 2009 conviction a child causing death. ECF No. 1. The confiled an application for a writ of habeas corputing this case. The previous application was file merits on January 14, 2014. See Smith v. Ken	er has not, however, filed an in forma pauperis  2. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a); 1915(a). Nevertheless,  3. de dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  4. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  4. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  5. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  6. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  7. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  8. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus  9. dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpu

application. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3). Therefore, petitioner's application must be dismissed without prejudice to its re-filing upon obtaining authorization from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court randomly assign a district judge to this action. Further, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed as a second or successive habeas corpus application without prejudice to its refiling with a copy of an order from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals authorizing petitioner to file a successive petition. These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). Dated: April 1, 2020 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE